DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 857 EA 026 547

AUTHOR Furman, Gail Chase
TITLE Schools in Community: Implications of a Sociological Framework.
PUB DATE Oct 94
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Philadelphia, PA, October 28-30, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bureaucracy; Community Change; *Community Involvement; Democratic Values; Educational Sociology; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; Organizational Change; *School Community Relationship; *School Role; Social Change; *Sociology

ABSTRACT

The concept of community is receiving much press but little theoretical classification. Sociological theory can provide a deeper theoretical understanding of the concept of community and the role of schools in community, by addressing the underlying factors that alienate schools from communities. This paper uses the classic Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft theoretical framework to analyze the role of schools in relation to the community, contemporary tensions surrounding this role, and the implications for policy that follow from this analysis. Several trends throughout the 20th century have eroded the balance between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in the schools--a shift toward more bureaucratic and centralized governance, a move from "natural" to "rational" will, changes in community structure, and the erosion of democratic ideals. A sociological analysis shows that the weakening of school-community links is due to an interaction between changes in the community and changes in the school itself; highlights the qualities and experiences lost through the shift to Gesellschaft; and suggests a direction for action. Ways to pull the school back toward the Gemeinschaft pole include: (1) promote authentic involvement of local community members in school governance; (2) restructure local school-district governance; and (3) confront the discrepancy between the corporate ethic and democratic values. The application of sociological theory to the community issue points to the persistence of community and potentially productive ways for schools to reconnect with it. (Contains 22 references and 2 notes.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 857

SCHOOLS IN COMMUNITY: IMPLICATIONS OF A SOCIOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Gail Chase Furman
Washington State University
October, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Furman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was prepared for presentation at the University Council for Educational Administration Convention, October 28-30, 1994, Philadelphia.

EA 026 547

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

> Whatever the future may have in store, one thing is certain. Unless local communal life can be restored, the public cannot adequately resolve its most urgent problem: to find and identify itself. (Dewey, 1927, p. 216)

> Though most principals, superintendents, and teachers have a desire to do better and are working as hard as they can to provide a quality education to every student they serve, the road is rough and the going is slow. The lead villain in this frustrating drama is the loss of community in our schools and in society itself. If we want to rewrite the script to enable good schools to flourish, we need to rebuild community. Community building must become the heart of any school improvement effort. Whatever else is involved--improving teaching, developing sensible curriculum, creating new forms of governance, providing more authentic assessment, empowering teachers and parents, increasing professionalism --it must rest on a foundation of community building. (Sergiovanni, 1994, xi)

Clearly, concerns about "community" are not new. Dewey's words from over sixty years ago capture the concerns of many educators today. We are concerned that community life is disintegrating and that our lives and those of our students are becoming increasingly fragmented and impersonal; we feel that we have lost a sense of "belonging" in our social worlds, including our schools; we fear that the disintegration of community will only continue as our lives are increasingly ruled by information technology and the fast-paced demands of work outside the home.

This concern with community has become a major theme in the current educational reform movement. As the above quote from Sergiovanni illustrates, loss of community is seen by some as <u>the</u> problem facing education. The reform movement approaches this community problem in two ways. First, a variety of "community-connection experiments" (Crowson and Boyd, 1993) have been proposed and undertaken to build stronger links between schools and communities. These include parent involvement programs, interagency collaboration, and some forms of site-based

management. Second, a variety of proposals to "personalize" school environments (McLaughlin and Talbert, 1990) and reconstitute the school as a "participatory community of learners" (Mitchell, 1990; Reyes, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1994) have been discussed. These two reform thrusts suggest that the concept of community is being used in two ways in current discussions of reform: the school as community and the school's linkages with the community of citizens that it serves.

In either case, the concept of community is receiving much press but little theoretical clarification. What do we mean by a "community" in a theoretical sense? Why is community such a dominant theme in education? Can the school be a community? What constitutes a community of citizens in late 20th century America? What is the school's place or role in relation to this community? Should this role be modified and, if so, how? How can authentic linkages be forged between schools and communities as they now exist? And, do specific reform proposals, such as site-based management, make a difference? To date, educational scholars and practitioners have given little attention to these underlying theoretical issues and questions.[1] The result is often a "band-aid" approach to school-community linkages based on assumptions of what we mean by community. For example, a popular reform is to establish site-based councils that claim to reflect the "diversity" of the community but may involve the participation of only a few hand-picked citizens and be allowed to address only a few hand-picked problems. Similarly, parent involvement programs may purport to enhance community linkages but instead treat parents as a teacher resource to be used as volunteers (Henry, in press).

What is needed to bring order to this discourse and direction to our "community-connections" reforms is a deeper theoretical understanding of the concept of community and of the role of schools in community. Sociological theory can make an important contribution in this regard. This paper explores the usefulness of one strand of community theory in the analysis of educational problems. Specifically, in this paper the

classic Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft theoretical framework is used to analyze the role of schools in relation to community, contemporary tensions surrounding this role, and the implications for policy which follow from this analysis.

Sociological Theory on Community--The Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft Continuum

According to Bender (1978), the concept of community is a fundamental "unit idea" of sociology. That is, community is both a construct and a frequently used unit of analysis in sociological work. Defining this construct is therefore an important task in sociology and other fields of study which use the community "unit idea."

The struggle to define community dates back to the beginning years of the field of sociology. The early German sociologists, including Tönnies, Weber and Durkheim, lived in a time of rapid industrialization and urbanization. They were interested in how these modernizing forces were impacting traditional patterns of social life. Indeed, it could be argued that sociology grew as a field partly because of this concern with radical changes in communal life. Tönnies, in particular, was concerned with potential disintegration of traditional, agrarian life. He struggled to understand the basic nature of this traditional communal life in contrast to life in the cities. The product of his work, the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft theoretical framework, continues to serve as a useful model for the field. Bender (1978) refers to Tönnie's framework as "a typology that has proven to be one of the discipline's most enduring and fruitful concepts for studying social change" (p. 17) which reflects "a surprising complexity and sensitivity to actual historical processes that is absent in many modern theories" (p. 13).

In Tönnie's theory, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft are constructs representing differing types of social interaction.[2] In Gemeinschaft, which is associated with traditional communities, relationships are based in kinship, friendship and neighborliness. These relationships are characterized by trust, intimacy and loyalty, and they promote feelings of belonging and personal security. In contrast, Gesellschaft is associated with the world of commerce and its marketplace relationships.

Gesellschaftlich relationships are characterized by contractual guarantees of performance, impersonalization and temporality, that is, they exist only during the period of the contract. Tönnies (1887/1957) compared the two types in these words:

> All intimate, private, and exclusive living together . . . is understood as life in Gemeinschaft (community). Gesellschaft (society) is public life--it is the world itself. (p. 37-38)

and

> In contrast to Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft is transitory and superficial. Accordingly, Gemeinschaft should be understood as a living organism, Gesellschaft as a mechanical aggregate and artifact. (p. 35)

Central to understanding the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft typology are the concepts of "natural will" and "rational will." "Natural will," which governs Gemeinschaft relationships, means that one person associates with or responds to another because it is natural to do so. Examples are a parent's response to a child's need for comfort and reassurance, the desire of spouses to provide companionship for each other, or friends offering condolence and assistance at the time of a death in the family. In contrast, the "rational will" of the Gesellschaft means that one person responds to another because they have a contractual agreement to do so. The "contract" can be as simple as the impromptu barter of eggs for flour, or as complex as a legally negotiated 100-year lease on a factory site. Thus, in the Gesellschaft, associating with another is always the means to an end. Tönnies' translator Charles Loomis explains:

> For instance, a group or a relationship can be willed because those involved wish to attain through it a definite end and are willing to join hands for this purpose, even though indifference or even antipathy may exist on other levels. In this case rational will . . . in which means and ends have been sharply differentiated . . . prevails. On the other hand, people may associate themselves together, as friends do, because they think the relation valuable as an end in and of itself. In this case it is natural or integral will which predominates. (Tönnies, 1887/1940, p. xv)

In Tönnies' system, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft are constructs of ideal "types" which do not exist in pure form. Rather, as Tönnies pointed out, all social systems are a

mix of gemeinschaftlich and gesellschaftlich relationships. Systems differ, however, in the relative dominance of one type or the other and, therefore, in the quality of the experiences of individuals within the system. In a system dominated by Gemeinschaft and "natural will," individuals will experience relatively more belongingness, permanence and a sense of security. In a system dominated by Gesellschaft and "rational will," individuals will experience relatively more isolation, transience and insecurity.

Tönnies saw an inevitable shift in industrialized Western society from the Gemeinschaft to the Gesellschaft. However, at the core of Tönnies' theory is the idea that Gemeinschaft is an inherent, enduring aspect of human social life. He wrote, "the force of Gemeinschaft persists, although with diminishing strength, even in the period of Gesellschaft, and remains the reality of social life" (Tönnies, 1887/1957, p. 232). In other words, Tönnies held that Gemeinschaft was an irreplaceable aspect of human experience which would never be totally subsumed by Gesellschaft. Thus, individuals in modern society continue to live in a "bifurcated" social world, participating in both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft relationships.

Tönnie's framework provides a theoretical lens for studying the social world. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft can be viewed as opposite poles of a continuum, which can be used to explore the relative salience of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in our social lives and institutions. As Bender states, "The focus of analytical interest becomes . . . the interaction and interplay of communal and noncommunal ways in the lives of all" and the "changes in salience toward either pole of the continuum" (1978, p. 43). In education, this theoretical lens could be applied to a variety of issues and problems. In the next section, I explore the usefulness of this lens in regard to the role of schools in community.

The Role of Schools in Community

Institutions, like individuals, exist in a bifurcated social world in which the values of the Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft interact. The relative salience of Gemeinschaft and

Gesellschaft in a particular institution depends on its purpose. Government agencies, for example, tend to be dominated by Gesellschaft; they operate for specific purposes through contractual arrangements with the citizenry. In contrast, religious institutions are closer to the Gemeinschaft pole; they represent "gathered communities" of individuals who voluntarily associate because of shared spiritual values. At the same time, however, religious institutions also reflect the Gesellschaft in that they operate by contractual arrangements in regard to monetary dues and hiring staff. Schools, like religious institutions, represent a mix of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, but for different reasons. They are not "gathered communities," in that participation of children is not voluntary but is legally mandated, and staff participation is primarily due to contractual agreements. On the other hand, schools are involved in one of the most intimate gemeinschaftlich functions, the raising of children. In looking at the role of schools in community, a central question is how the relative salience of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft has changed over the years, and how this shift has affected the school's role.

Historically, the public school served as a "bridge" between two social worlds, the Gemeinschaft and the Gesellschaft. Until the early 20th century, schools were firmly linked to traditional local communities, which were gemeinschaftlich in character. Whether urban or agrarian, these local communities were fairly homogeneous and stable, marked by close kinship and neighborhood ties. The school served the local community by educating children in the ways of society at large (the Gesellschaft), instilling in them the skills of communication and commerce needed for social and economic success. But, as the first social system beyond the family and church, schools were also asked to support the values and mores of the local community. Thus, "local control" referred not only to political governance arrangements, but also to the community's sense of ownership, or "moral" control, of the school's mission.

While a tension between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft values in the school was inevitable, a workable balance was the norm. The local community believed the school

was a necessary supplement to the family and that education was the key to success in the larger society. More important, the local community supported the perceived values of the Gesellschaft--the ideals of democracy, individualism, free-enterprise and economic opportunity that supposedly governed the larger society. Throughout the twentieth century, however, several trends have eroded this workable balance between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft in the schools and changed the relationship among local community, schools and the larger society.

First, schools as organizations have become more bureaucratic and governance of schools has become more centralized. Callahan's work (1962) and Tyack and Hansot's (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Hansot,1982) histories of American education clearly document the origins of the corporate, bureaucratic model for school organization and the gradual shift to state-level centralized governance. Political reform of local school boards at the turn of the twentieth century contributed to bureaucratization and the erosion of local control. As Tyack (1974) explains, under the guise of "getting the schools out of politics," reform led to election of a few "successful men" to local boards. These persons represented the elite class of business and professionals rather than the largely working classes who were served by neighborhood schools.

> As men who had perfected large organizations, they had national reference groups and thought in cosmopolitan rather than merely local terms. Successful in their own careers, they assumed that what was good for their class and private institutions was good public policy as well . . . These leaders were impressed with the newly developed forms of corporate structure which had revolutionized decision-making in vast business organizations. (pp. 130-131)

Thus, the culture of the elite leaders of business came to dominate the schools. In terms of the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft continuum, bureaucratization and centralization shifted the school away from its close ties to local Gemeinschaft values. In essence, the perceived mission of the school gradually changed from serving the needs of the gemeinschaftlich local community by being a "bridge" to success in the Gesellschaft, to

serving the economic interests of the elites. The role of the school shifted toward the Gesellschaft pole of the continuum.

Closely related to this first trend, the quality of relationships within schools has changed. Bureaucracy and centralization have led to a proliferation of rules and regulations that govern the work lives of educators. The corporate model for schools has led to "contractualization" of educators' responsibilities, especially through negotiated union contracts. And the business values imported into education have created a mindset of educational "productivity," with student learning as units of production. The outcome is that relationships within schools are increasingly governed by "rational will," rather than by the "natural will" of caring for children.

Third, the nature of the local community has changed--the "decline" so often noted in recent literature. Changes in families have been well documented (Hoffer & Coleman, 1990; Coleman, 1987). Communities have changed as people work farther from their homes. The number of face-to-face contacts with neighbors has decreased dramatically in America since World War II. Interchangeable suburbs have replaced individually identifiable neighborhoods; some traditionally ethnic neighborhoods have disappeared (Coleman, 1985; Wagstaff & Gallagher, 1990). Families and neighborhoods have become less coherent and exhibit fewer of the traditional gemeinschaftlich qualities. Children go to day-care centers, people shop at supermarkets, life assumes a more anonymous, interchangeable, or gesellschaftlich quality. Although Gemeinschaft may "persist" (Bender, 1978), it is in a more fragmented form. The local "community" served by the neighborhood school is no longer a "neighborhood" and lacks a coherent voice to influence the schools. The local control of the school's "mission" has been undermined.

Fourth, the ideals of democracy and free-enterprise, which supposedly governed the larger society, have become tarnished (America's Parasite Economy, 1992). There seems to be little consensus in the late twentieth century around national goals or a national ethic. Instead, the values of the corporate world--profit and competition--have

come to dominate the larger society, to crowd out the traditional ideals of democratic participation, individualism and free-enterprise opportunity. We tend to be disillusioned with our political and institutional leaders and regard with cynicism the business-dominated values of the Gesellschaft. Kreyche (1993) calls the disillusionment with national leaders "the demise of moral authority":

> Perhaps even more important in the current value crisis is the ongoing demise of moral authority, which implies having a natural measure of control or influence over another. Presidents such as George Washington and Abraham Lincoln not only were the nation's civic authorities, but also were seen as moral leaders . . . Moral authority is not bestowed, but is based on right conduct and the depths of one's character and personal commitment. (p. 98)

The disillusionment with leaders and the values of the larger society is particularly acute for persons in poverty and for persons whose access to the economic mainstream is impeded by cultural and language barriers. Thus, many people believe that the ideals of democracy and free enterprise governing the larger society have been lost, and they no longer aspire to participate successfully in this larger society, the Gesellschaft. If the school has traditionally been perceived as the bridge to the Gesellschaft, many people no longer want to use that bridge. Wagstaff and Gallagher (1990) state:

> It is a long-recognized bond between schools and parents to turn children into productive citizens. Yet many American families in the 1980s are either unable or unwilling to shape, support, stimulate, or encourage their children in the traditional ways schools expect" (emphasis added, p. 94).

Educators frequently interpret this alienation from the school's traditional mission as a symptom of dysfunctional families and communities. This analysis suggests, however, that the problem centers on the role of the schools, and not on the dysfunctionality of the community.

In summary, the trends of bureaucratization and centralization, changes in community structure, and erosion of the ideals of a democratic society have altered the role of the school in relation to community. Schools have become more alienated from

the fragmented local community in governance and structure and more in resonance with the marketplace values of the Gesellschaft, at the same time that these values are being discounted by a growing segment of the population. In essence, the perceived mission of schools has undergone a subtle transformation--from educating for participation in a democracy to educating for working in a corporate-dominated technocracy--and this transformed mission is not resonant with local community values. But the ability of the fragmented gemeinschaftlich local community to resist this change in the role of the school has all but vanished. Thus, the role of the school in relation to community has become troubled and ambiguous. In essence, the school has lost its identity as the valued "bridge" to a better life.

This analysis surfaces a number of intriguing and complex issues. Can schools, for example, shape a new mission that will both serve the larger society and be resonant with local community values? Might this mission be to educate children for participation in a multicultural democracy, as Greene (1993) has suggested? In so doing, could schools be instrumental in regeneration of a national civic morality based in democratic ideals? While these ideas are worthy of exploration, they are beyond the scope of this paper. Here I will consider the implications of the foregoing analysis for the community issue in education.

Implications for The Community Issue in Education

At the heart of the foregoing analysis is the issue of the school's mission or role in relation to local community. The analysis suggests that this role has weakened as a number of factors have pulled the school to the Gesellschaft pole of the continuum. While on the surface this conclusion is not much different than the assumption guiding current "community-connections" reforms, that is, that school-community linkages need to be improved, the analysis adds several dimensions to this picture. Viewing the school/community issue through the lens of the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft continuum,

and the school as being pulled toward the Gesellschaft pole, stimulates a search for causes of the shift toward Gesellschaft, and, therefore, implications for action.

First, the analysis suggests that a number of factors interact to affect school-community links. These links are weak not only because communities have disappeared or are "dysfunctional," as educators often assume. Indeed, according to Tönnie's theory, communities will always "persist," although perhaps in altered forms. Rather, the links have weakened because the school itself has changed. The school in its structure, ambiance and perceived mission has shifted to the Gesellschaft due to centralization and importation of corporate/business values, including the "contractualization" of within-school relationships. Thus, the weakening of school-community links is due to an interaction between changes in community and changes in the school itself.

Second, the analysis highlights the qualities and experiences that are lost through this shift to Gesellschaft. The drift to Gesellschaft means a loss of the qualities associated with the "natural will" of the Gemeinschaft: trust, belongingness, security and permanence. A strong prima facie case can be made that the loss of these qualities is a serious problem for schools, resulting in alienation of students, parents and educators. If the community of parents is to entrust their children to the care of the schools, they must trust that the school is a secure environment where their children really do belong, rather than a training institution set up to turn their children into productive workers who will serve the interests of the Gesellschaft. And, if educators are to promote belongingness for students, they must themselves be involved in "natural will" relationships with these students, instead of fulfilling the terms of their "contract." Thus, this analysis provides a better sense of why we are concerned about community in education.

Third, the analysis suggests a direction for action. To improve school-community links, more is needed than "band-aids" that purport to involve citizens in running the schools. The central question from this analysis is, "How can the school as an institution be pulled back toward the Gemeinschaft pole?" To do this, the factors that have

alienated schools from community need to be addressed, and most of these center on the role and character of the school. In the following paragraphs, several of these factors are discussed.

Centralization of school governance along with the establishment of "elite" boards has dis-articulated schools from a sense of local "moral" control of the school's mission. The key to addressing this issue is to promote the authentic involvement of local community members in school governance, including determination of the values (Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft) that prevail in the school. Site-based decision-making is a promising development in this direction, but needs to be guided by a deeper understanding of community and of the values issue. The modern community served by a school typically is fragmented or multi-faceted, consisting of several independent sub-communities, perhaps organized along ethnic lines. How to involve each of these sub-communities in site-based decision-making is a complex problem. Educators may need to be proactive in the identification of sub-communities and the non-school organizations that involve sub-community members in authentic, gemeinschaftlich ways. Then, representation in site-based councils could be based on recommendations of these sub-community organizations. Recent work by Heath and McLaughlin (1993) begins to explore this idea.

In regard to the values that prevail in the school and determine its "mission," continued governance by "elite" school boards needs to be critically examined. Site-based councils will have little impact on the overall sense of mission if the Gesellschaft values of the "elite" school board continue to dominate school district policy. As the site-based movement matures, educators and state policy-makers may need to consider how to restructure the governance of local school districts. It may be possible to devolve critical policy decisions regarding the instructional program to site-councils, with the school district organization serving in a management function.

Finally, educators need to confront the issue of democratic national ideals. Schools have always and probably always will serve to educate children to be "productive citizens." What does this mean when the traditional ideals of democracy and free-enterprise have been overshadowed by the ethics of corporate competition and profit-making? What does this mean in a multicultural society in which many sub-communities are alienated from Gesellschaft economic aspirations? Educators need to understand this issue for schools and their critical role in regard to it. They need to help create a new sense of mission around the concept of democratic participation. They need to present and model to children authentic ways to participate in a multicultural democracy. And they need to critically examine the pervasiveness of the corporate mindset in education, which is antithetical to these goals.

While there are individual voices in the field of education addressing some of these issues around community, the analysis presented in this paper suggests that the issue should be viewed more holistically so that our community reform efforts are not superficial and fragmented, but coordinated to address the important underlying factors that alienate school from community.

Conclusions

"You can't go home again" is a phrase that comes to mind in thinking about schools and community. Community isn't what it was, and schools cannot relate to community as they used to do. Dewey's plea to restore "local communal life" as it used to exist is not realistic. Yet, this analysis concludes on a hopeful note. By examining more deeply the community issue, in this case through the application of sociological theory, we can conclude that educators, children and parents are not the just the victims of community disintegration. Rather, "community" persists, and there may well be productive ways for schools to reconnect with it.

Notes

1. Two recent exceptions are Sergiovanni's (1994) work on building community in schools and Furman and Merz's (in press) analysis of the interagency collaboration reform. Both of these sources explore the application of sociological theory to these issues.

2. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft are loosely translated into English as "community" and "society" respectively; however, the English terms lack the full connotations of the German, and the German terms are used here. The German adjective forms, gemeinschaftlich and gesellschaftlich are used as well.

References

America's parasite economy (1992). The Economist, 325, 21-24.

Bender, T. (1978). Community and social change in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Callahan, R.E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, J.S. (1985). Schools and the communities they serve. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 527-532.

Coleman, J.S., (1987). Families and schools. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 33-38.

Crowson, R.L., & Boyd, W.L. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. American Journal of Education, 101, 140-179.

Dewey, J. (1927). The public and its problems. New York: Holt and Co.

Furman, G.C., & Merz, C. (in press). Schools, community and reform: Applying a sociological framework. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), Coordination among schools, families, and communities: Prospects for educational reform. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Greene, M. (1993). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. Educational Researcher, 22(1), 13-18.

Heath, S.B., & McLaughlin, M.W. (Eds.). (1993). Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender. New York: Teachers College Press.

Henry, M. (in press). Parents, the forgotten educators: A feminist perspective. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hoffer, T.B., & Coleman, J.S. (1990). Changing families and communities: Implications for schools. In L.L. Cunningham & B. Mitchell (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts in families, communities, and schools. Eighty-ninth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Part II (pp. 118-134). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kreyche, G.F. (1993). The demise of moral authority. USA Today, 122 (2580), 98.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Talbert, J. (1990). Constructing a personalized school environment. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 230-235.

Mitchell, B. (1990). Children, youth, and restructured schools: Views from the field. In L.L. Cunningham & B. Mitchell (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts in families, communities, and schools. Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II (pp. 52-68). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reyes, P. (1994, October). Cultural citizenship and social responsibility: A call for change in educational administration. UCEA Presidential Address, 1993. Presented at the Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.

Sergiovanni, T.J., (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tönnies, F. (1940). Fundamental concepts of sociology (gemeinschaft und gesellschaft) (C.P. Loomis, Trans.). New York: American Book Co. (Original work published 1887)

Tönnies, F. (1957). Community and society (gemeinschaft und gesellschaft) (C.P. Loomis, Trans.). New York: American Book Co. (Original work published 1887)

Tyack, D.B. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D.B., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Wagstaff, L.H., & Gallagher, K.S. (1990). Families, communities, and educational leadership. In L.L. Cunningham & B. Mitchell (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts in families, communities, and schools. Eighty-ninth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Part II (pp. 91-117). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.